

## Student Learning Outcomes Matrix - Academic Year 2021 – 2022

Note: If you are using different direct and indirect measures for different degree programs, please replicate the matrix, using one matrix for each program that has different measures. If different programs use the same measures, only one copy of the matrix is needed.

Course	Tool	Benchmark	Assessment Results			
			Total # of students observed	Total # of students meeting expectation	Percentage of students meeting expectation	1. DNM 2. ME 3. EE 4. Insuff. Data
<b>SLO 1: Students will demonstrate accurate knowledge of the foundational principles required for the sport management profession</b>						
SPST 100	Foundational Knowledge Coverage and Performance Rubric	1.1 7 CPC areas covered	92	92	100%	EE
		1.2 80% of students will score 70% on exams	92	66	72%	DNM
SPST 421	Foundational knowledge rubric (direct)	Project will score 2< in all categories	31	31	100%	EE
<b>SLO 2: Students will demonstrate information literacy</b>						
SPST 240	Legal Research, Information Literacy Rubric (direct)	<20% students <2 in any one category	46	40	87%	ME
SPST 399	Information Literacy Rubric (direct)	<20% students <3 in any one category	30	25	83%	ME
<b>SLO 3: Students will exhibit college-level writing and correctly utilize industry appropriate formatting.</b>						
SPST 421	Capstone - Writing Rubric (direct)	<20% students <2 in any one category	31	27	87%	ME
SPST 390	Site Supervisor Evaluation - Writing rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	8	4	50%	DNM
SPST 490	Site Supervisor Evaluation - Writing rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	7	2	29%	DNM

<b>SLO 4: Students will perform oral communication practices that facilitate effective communication with others</b>						
SPST 420	Presentation Rubric (direct)	<20% students <2 in any one category	18	18	100%	EE
SPST 390	Site Supervisor Evaluation - comm. rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	8	4	50%	DNM
SPST 490	Site Supervisor Evaluation - comm. rubric (indirect)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	7	6	86%	ME
<b>SLO 5: Students will accurately apply their learning in assignments by practicing the role of industry professionals.</b>						
SPST 215	Applied Learning Rubric (direct)	80% of students score 2< in all categories	50	48	96%	EE
SPST 280	Applied Learning Rubric (direct)	90% of students score 2< in all categories	35	35	100%	EE
<b>SLO 6: Students will employ networking skills in experiential opportunities</b>						
SPST 390	Networking rubric (direct)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	8	8	100%	EE
SPST 490	Networking rubric (direct)	80% of students score 3 in all categories	7	6	86%	ME

### **Student Learning Outcomes Matrix Narrative:**

Your outcomes assessment plan must include, at minimum, two direct and two indirect measures of all student learning outcomes. Some measurement tools will be used to measure more than one student learning outcome. Each student learning outcomes must be measured at least once; including more and varied measures is a better practice and is encouraged. Below, narrate how you “**close the loop**” by describing any **changes and improvements you made and plan to make as a result of your assessment activity**:

- Address ALL SLOs – those that meet or exceed expectations and those that do not.
- Explain why you have measures with insufficient data.
- Describe how this outcomes assessment data drives curricular and other decisions.
- Describe how you have improved/changed this year based on this data (close the loop).

### **COVID-19 explanation**

Our campus moved back to a relatively “normal” academic year for 2021-22. Social distancing was no longer required and all students were expected to be present in F2F classes unless they were in quarantine or isolation. Faculty were not required to provide remote learning options (Zoom) for students, although some did on a case by case (or temporary) basis. The alternate grading format of satisfactory/passing/unsatisfactory was not an option for students and we returned to standard A-F grading. These stipulations allowed us to proceed as usual with our teaching, grading, and assessment.

### **SLO 1**

Measure 1.1 (direct) - The instructor intentionally selected the amount of content coverage to be sure that this benchmark could be met. Given the diversity of our program electives and required courses, this provides the type of foundation that we want for students entering (or considering) our program.

Measure 1.2 (direct) - The benchmark was not met for a couple reasons. First, most students were participating in a flipped classroom for the first time, where scores for each of these areas (outside of Integrative Experiences) came from short quizzes students completed before the start of the week on course content. Students who were unfamiliar with the flipped classroom or struggled to adjust to it, during their first year of college, is likely reflected in their low scores on these quizzes. To address this issue, more resources and assistance needs to be provided to students to help them better prepare for the flipped classroom and teach themselves the basic principles outside of class. Another potential reason for failing to meet the benchmarks could have been in the assignment design for Integrative Experiences. This category was calculated based on different assignments students had the option to complete. Students who chose a couple of the more challenging assignments may have struggled to achieve a good score because of the need for greater scaffolding and support in the assignments. In the future, I will work to identify more resources and workshops that can support students in their completion of these assignments. Additionally, I will explore ways pieces of the assignment can be broken up over the course of the semester to help students develop the component skills they need to be successful.

Measure 2 (direct) - The Capstone project selections for these two semesters were some of the best we have seen of late. Student groups were consistent in their progress towards comprehensive understanding and demonstrated that in their final written project and corresponding presentation. While the evaluators found strengths and weaknesses of each project, overall the students worked together to incorporate accurate learning and subject matter that they had gleaned over their sport management education.

## **SLO 2**

Measure 1 (direct) - Students were largely successful on this assignment in exploring their assumptions and researching both sides of an issue. More work could be done to teach students basic skills in citing and researching articles; however, students do a nice job of embracing lessons throughout the semester of embracing different viewpoints and working to challenge their initial assumptions.

Measure 2 (direct) - The course was designed with intentional scaffolding of instruction and married with assessments that were also scaffolded. Students worked on assessments that built to the final assessment, so all work was linked to instruction, practice in class and then modeled after the instruction and practice. This all led students to successfully demonstrating competencies in these areas.

## **SLO 3**

Measure 1 (direct) - These groups of students worked to create a more polished final document. While there were definitely section differences, the vast majority of students worked to produce strong writing appropriate for the task.

Measure 2 (indirect) - Typical low numbers during semesters make meeting this benchmark a challenge. A few of the practicum roles offered very little in terms of professional writing opportunities. Professional communication remains an important skill and will continue to be critiqued and supported through coursework.

Measure 3 (indirect) - We had several internships that ran into issues with accumulating quality contact hours that resulted in less than optimal situations. The frustration with the quantity and type of work that ended up being used to fulfill requirements was partly responsible for the low performance in this area. Written communication skills continue to be addressed through coursework and individual coaching sessions with students. The quality and professionalism of work submitted through assignments was excellent although some site supervisors continue to expect and need more professionalism of student interns.

## **SLO 4**

Measure 1 (direct) - When this course shifted to repeated informal discussion leading, students were provided more opportunities to become comfortable speaking and engaging with their peers. An additional class activity exploring non-verbal communication also drew student attention how these elements contribute to (and can detract from) quality communication. I was pleased to see the overall impact in formal presentation scores which I feel were a direct result of these smaller course changes.

Measure 2 (indirect) - Typical low numbers during semesters make meeting this benchmark a challenge. With all three students earning above average or better ratings, there isn't cause for concern at the moment other than to reinforce the importance of professional communication in the workplace. This is an area students tend to need the most support in. Through coursework and 1-on-1 meetings, I seek to address these challenges directly and in specific ways to student and placement needs.

Measure 3 (indirect) - Excellent ratings along with one an above average rating for oral communication is encouraging and indicative that our students are better prepared in this area than in writing. Much like written communication skills, these competencies are addressed through individual coaching sessions with students. We will need to continue stressing, teaching, and practicing these skills.

### **SLO 5**

Measure 1 (direct) - Students undertook a final project that allowed them to take the concepts learned throughout the semester and apply them to a final project case study. Working in groups, students selected a city for expansion baseball and were required to identify and research comparable markets using specific data. Using the provided fact sheet and goals, students predicted revenues and constructed a roster to learn how the business side of sports (generating revenues and incurring expenses) is intertwined with the on-field performance and how there are often additional costs needed to generate additional revenues. Finally, students were tasked with creating financial statements and a budget, while assessing the necessity of expenses and determining what budgeting methods can be used by organizations to forecast future revenues and expenses. This project continues to be a good applied learning task for students. Repeated iterations have refined the data and instructions given to students and they appreciate the timeliness of the project.

Measure 2 (direct) - Students were given ample time to work in class on their case studies with their teammates. This allowed them to ask frequent questions, collaborate together, and work on employing course concepts to a real-world scenario. With one form of summative assessment occurring prior to case study work, students were more confident and accurate in their application of ideas.

### **SLO 6**

Measure 1 (direct) - Continued preparation work in SPST 105 makes student success in this SLO more likely. With ample opportunities for clarifying expectations, students are very adept at preparing a quality LOP. and careful selection and acceptance of site placements, students continue to

Measure 2 (direct) - Continued preparation work in SPST 105 makes student success in this SLO more likely. With careful selection and acceptance of site placements, students continue to be able to achieve the networking success that is a valuable component of field work.

## Program-Level Operational Effectiveness Goals Matrix Academic Year 2021-22

OEG and Measurement Tool	Identify the Benchmark	Data Summary	Assessment Results
<b>OEG 1: Provide opportunities for students to engage with a diversity of sport practitioners</b>			
Measure 1: Guest speakers, alumni, practitioner, consultant involvement in classrooms	30 times per academic year, current students will have a chance to engage with industry practitioners	A total of 46 engagement opportunities were provided to students (EDS - 6; KB -10, ED - 15; PG - 15)	EE
<b>OEG 2: Strive to maintain connections and support to graduates of our program.</b>			
Measure 1: Maintain electronic communication with alumni groups	At least four posts per month will be made collectively through our social media outlets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twitter</li> <li>• Instagram</li> <li>• Snapchat</li> <li>• YouTube channel</li> </ul> State of the Union letter (2/year)	1 post/month - June, August, May 2 posts/month - July 3 posts/month - September 4+ posts/month - October, November, December, January, February, March, April  SOTU - 2 times	DNM
Measure 2: Create mechanisms for alumni involvements	Host one event per year that is available and inclusive of SJFC alumni	End of the Year Banquet	ME
<b>OEG 3: Have faculty that are engaged in the sport management industry and/or academia.</b>			
Measure 1: Faculty activity	All faculty will attend at least one sport conference or engage as an industry consultant at least once per academic year	5/5 faculty members were either engaged as an industry consultant or attended a conference during the 2021-22 academic year. In addition 4 of our part-time instructors were also engaged in this manner during the academic year.	ME
<b>OEG 4: Provide mechanisms for students to graduate in a timely manner.</b>			
Measure 1: Long-range planning	At least 75% of sophomore-senior students will have a course progression plan in UAchieve or some other place (e.g. Google Drive) that is shared between advisor and student	68/103 = 66% of students who were declared as SPST majors had a course progression plan.	DNM
Measure 2: Course scheduling	All required courses are offered at least once per year. Ten separate electives (seven that are distinct) are offered through an academic year.	All required courses were offered at least once each semester and we offered ten distinct electives with three of them being offered more than once (thirteen	EE

		total electives). In addition, we offered courses each semester (3 additional) that contributed to the college's general education core.	
<b>OEG 5: Partner with students in the content and development of their educational experience.</b>			
Measure 1: Student opportunities for engagement	Provide students at least two opportunities per academic year to provide feedback and engage in various aspects of their education.	All students have an opportunity to provide feedback during the two formal advising meetings during the academic year.  During our faculty searches during both fall and spring semesters, we invited students to engage with and provide feedback on the candidates we brought to campus. We used and considered their feedback during the deliberation between candidates.	EE

**Required Narrative: Close the loop and explain why you met, exceeded or did not meet any expectations. Explain why there was insufficient data (if applicable). Discuss what you may do differently next year or any corrective action you will take.**

**OEG 1** - This is an area we continue to take pride in. As COVID made us more adept at Zoom technology, most instructors now feel quite comfortable providing a virtual option for speakers to engage with their students. We know these experiences are extremely valuable to students and work to recognize all of the speakers that make time to engage with our students through thank you notes and swag.

**OEG 2**

Measure 1 - During the heart of the academic year, we are very effective at meeting our benchmark regarding outward communication. This is more challenging during the summer and at the fringes of the academic year. The Director of Experiential Learning and Outreach was the primary producer and manager of this communication and we will likely have some changes moving forward once we find their replacement. We will also be having some conversations about whether this is the best measure and benchmark for this OEG. Minor changes will be made for AY 2022-23 and are reflected in the updated matrix (see p. 27), but there may be more significant changes as a result of the writing of our self-study.

Measure 2 - We had several alumni present at our year end banquet this year. As we honored two of the faculty members who were leaving the department, including alumni remembering and personal statements about the impact these faculty had on them was very special.

**OEG 3** - This is an area we continue to find success in. Between volunteer work, conference attendance, and industry work, our faculty work hard to remain current in the field. When onboarding our new faculty and staff, we will be sure to state this expectation and help them to achieve this benchmark.

**OEG 4, Measure 1** - Emily's sabbatical and the overall number of majors may have contributed to this. We had several students who during advising indicated an intent to change their major, but did not actually complete the necessary paperwork. With the onboarding of new faculty this next academic year, we will be sure to more closely explain and demonstrate our advising expectations.

**OEG 4, Measure 2** - Despite the challenges in staffing, we were able to still offer students a variety of options that opened them up to the breadth of the industry. Our elective offerings continue to be offered regularly and are taught by highly qualified faculty and specialized adjuncts. We are excited about the new individuals starting this fall and hope that some of their unique qualifications and interests will afford us the opportunity to continue offering a diversity of electives.

**OEG 5** - We are proud of our partnership with students. As a small teaching-focused institution, being a partner with our students in their educational journey is a hallmark of our program. Each instructor works hard to show students their options and provide them the support they need to make their educational decisions. By offering feedback in multiple ways from multiple instructors, we hope to be minimizing the communication barriers that some students may feel towards specific department members.



## PROGRAM INFORMATION PROFILE

*This profile offers information about the program in the context of its mission, basic purpose and key features.*

**Name of Institution:** St. John Fisher College

**Program/Specialized Accreditor(s):** COSMA

**Institutional Accreditor:** Middle States

**Date of Next Comprehensive Program Accreditation Review:** 2023-24 Academic Year

**Date of Next Comprehensive Institutional Accreditation Review:** 2025-26 Academic Year

**URL where accreditation status is stated:**

<https://www.sjfc.edu/about/institutional-initiatives/accreditation-and-assessment/middle-states-accreditation/>

### Indicators of Effectiveness with Undergraduates [As Determined by the Program]

Graduation			
	Year: 2021-22	# of graduates: 22	Graduation Rates Freshman Entry: 54% (4 years), 63% (5 years) Transfer Entry: 55% (3 years), 64% (4 years)
Average time to Degree			
	Year: 2021-22	4 year degree Freshman entry: 9.3 terms Transfer entry: 6.1 terms	5 year degree: not calculated by college
Annual Transfer Activity (into program)			
	Year: 2021-22	# of transfers: 11	Transfer rate: not calculated by college Transfer retention rate: 100%
Graduates Entering Graduate School			
	Year: 2021-22	# of graduates: 22	# entering graduate school: 5
Job Placement			
	Year: 2021-22	# of graduates: 22	Sport industry employment: 11 Non-sport industry employment: 6

*Form developed by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. © updated 2020*